

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. By way of this paper, Claims 1-7, 9, 12-20 have been amended, Claim 21 has been cancelled, and new Claim 22 has been added herein.

The foregoing amendments and following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding office action, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Examiner stated that claim 10 does not find antecedent basis in the specification as filed.

Applicants have added support for claim 10 as filed by amending the specification at page 8, as specified above. The added support reflects the language of claim 10 as filed, and so no new matter has been added. Applicants believe that the specification now provides adequate support for claim 10.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 17 have been amended to delete the term "(including jpeg 2000)" as requested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 12-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicants have amended claims 12 -20 as suggested in the Examiner's last office action. These claims are now directed to a computer readable medium tangibly embodying a program that, when executed by a computer, causes the computer to perform claimed method steps.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 9, 12-15, and 19 are rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of McIntyre. Claims 5 and 16 are rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of McIntyre, and further in view of Wang. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of McIntyre, and further in view of Robinson.

Claims 7, 8, 11, and 18 are rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of McIntyre, and further in view of Bernius. Claims 10 and 20 are rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of McIntyre, and further in view of Patton. Claim 21 is rejected as unpatentable over Shiimori in view of Anderson.

There are at least two differences between Shiimori and the presently pending amended claims. Shiimori does not disclose a unique ID wherein both a storage location for a high resolution image and a network address of a fulfillment provider are associated with it and which are used by another viewing device (not a user device) to identify a high resolution image over a communication network. Shiimori could not possibly disclose this use of a unique ID because Shiimori does not teach the claimed separate (1) user device, (2) a viewing device, (3) a fulfillment provider, and (4) web site; all of which communicate over a network as recited in the presently amended independent claims 1, 12, and 22. McIntyre has been cited by the examiner for its teaching of providing a high resolution image from a user to the fulfillment provider and so does not cure the deficiencies of Shiimori as explained above.

Moreover, Shiimori does not show a viewing device accessing a web site. Rather, Shiimori shows a camera viewer displaying images from a camera, see paragraph [0147] and Figs. 17 and 18. The present invention includes network connected viewing devices that access a web site over a network for viewing images. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended to more clearly point out these distinctions of the present invention. Newly added claim 22 also recites these limitations and so all of the presently pending independent claims are patentable over Shiimori.

Because McIntyre does not cure these deficiencies of Shiimori, all the presently amended independent claims are now allowable. The remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they include the limitations of the independent claims from which they depend. All of the amendments made to the claims herein are supported by the patent application specification in FIGS. 1, 2 and 3, and their corresponding description beginning at page 4, line 28, under "Detailed Description of the Invention" through page 6, line 22, for FIGS. 1 and 2; page 7, line 10, through page 8, line 17, for FIG. 3.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in the event that a phone interview will expedite prosecution of this application towards allowance.

This Application is now believed to be in condition for favorable reconsideration and early allowance, and such actions are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company's, Deposit Account No. 05-0225.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Eugene I. Shkurko, Esq.
Patent Legal Staff
Registration No. 36,678

EIS:cvn

Attachment(s)

Telephone No.: (585) 253-0123

Facsimile No.: (585) 477-1148